REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 5-12, 16-19 and 21-22 are amended; and Claims 13-15 are canceled by the present amendment. Support for the amended can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.[1] No new matter is presented.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issues; Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Misawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,444,482 hereinafter "Misawa"); Claims 19-22, 19/23, 20/23, 21/24 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Riek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,179, hereinafter "Reik"); and Claims 1 and 3-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wactlar (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,667) in further view of Nagano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,651,087, hereinafter "Nagano").

In response to the rejection based on Misawa, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 16-18 state novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by Misawa.

Amended Claim 16 relates to an information processing apparatus including a recording means for recording a first two-dimensional code designating a moving picture recorded on an external storage medium. The information processing apparatus also includes a means for reading a second two-dimensional code from the external storage medium and means for determining if the second two dimensional code corresponds to the first two dimensional code.

[1] e.g., specification at Figs. 17 and 33-44.

An exemplary, non-limiting embodiment is depicted, for example, at pp. 77-90 and Figs. 33-44 of the specification. Video and still picture information recorded by the recording apparatus may be labeled with a two dimensional code, shown in Fig. 34, and a corresponding external storage medium (e.g., a video cassette) storing this same video and still information is labeled with a corresponding two-dimensional code. When the information processing apparatus reads the two-dimensional code from the external storage medium, it is able to perform a search to determine if the video and still picture information stored at the information processing apparatus includes the same code read from the external storage medium. If the code from the storage medium and the code from the stored video and still picture information match, then the data stored on the external storage medium is the same as that recorded to the information processing apparatus. Such a method allows the user to perform a book-keeping function, as described, for example, at pp. 81-82.

Specifically, Claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

> recording means for recording a first two-dimensional code designating a moving picture recorded on an external storage medium, said external storage medium being remote from said information processing apparatus...
> means for reading a second two-dimensional code from said external storage medium; and
> means for determining if said second two-dimensional code corresponds to said first two-dimensional code

Amended independent Claims 17 and 18 recite similar features, and therefore the arguments presented below also apply to these claims.

Turning to the applied reference, Misawa describes a digital electronic camera for selectively recording the frame of a still image in movie fields of an image in a recording medium. In rejecting Claim 16, the outstanding Official Action relies on col. 2, lines 45-49 of Misawa which states the "digital camera (1) is adapted to be operative in response to a manipulation of an operator to selectively record in an optical disk (25) image data

representing a still image of an object and consecutive images of the image in the form of moving pictures".[2] Thus, Misawa simply describes a digital camera which has two modes of operation, one mode of operation allows an operator to selectively record data representing a still image of an object and a second mode that allows for consecutive images of the object to be recorded in the form of moving pictures.

In contrast, as discussed above, amended Claim 16 relates to using a two-dimensional code to match data stored at the information processing apparatus with information stored in a remote external storage medium. Specifically, amended Claim 16 recites recording a first two-dimensional code designating a moving picture recorded on an external storage medium, reading a second two-dimensional code from said external storage medium, and determining if said second two-dimensional code corresponds to said first two-dimensional code. Misawa fails, at any point, to teach or suggest any of these above noted claimed features.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons as given with respect to Claim 16, it is also submitted that Claims 17 and 18 patentably define over Misawa.

Claims 19-22, 19/23, 20/23, 21/24, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Riek. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 19, 21 and 22 state novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied reference.

Claims 19, 21 and 22 are amended to further clarify using a two-dimensional code to identify data, as discussed above. Specifically, amended Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

> reproducing means for retrieving a first two-dimensional code ... from an internal storage medium, said first two-dimensional code designating a moving picture recorded on an external storage medium...
>
> means for reading a second two-dimensional code from said external storage medium; and

[2] Outstanding Official Action, p. 5.

means for determining if said second two-dimensional code corresponds to said first two-dimensional code.

Amended Claims 21 and 22 recite similar features, and therefore the arguments presented below also apply to these claims.

Turning to the applied reference, Riek describes a method and apparatus for encoding high-fidelity still images in MPEG bit streams. A frame of an uncompressed digital video signal is selected for encoding as a high-fidelity still image, and the digital video signal is encoded using additional bits to produce an enhanced MPEG encoded bit stream.[3]

However, Reik fails to teach or suggest the above noted features recited in amended Claim 19.

As noted above, independent Claim 19 relates to using a two-dimensional code to match data stored at the information processing apparatus, with information stored in a remote external storage medium. Specifically, amended Claim 19 recites retrieving a first two-dimensional code from an internal storage medium, reading a second two-dimensional code from said external storage medium, and determining if the second two-dimensional code corresponds to the first two-dimensional code. Reik fails, at any point, to teach or suggest any features relating to the above noted features recited in amended Claim 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons as given with respect to amended Claim 19, it is also submitted that Claims 21 and 22 patentably define over Riek.

In response to the rejection based on the combination of Wactlar and Nagano, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 5-12 state novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by Wactlar and/or Nagano.

Amended Claim 1 relates to an information processing apparatus that records (in a first recording means) one moving picture in at least one recording increment, and also

[3] Riek at Figs 4-6.

records (in a second recording means) a still picture corresponding to a predetermined one of the recording increments of the moving picture. The information processing apparatus also includes a ***user interface configured to receive a user instruction to modify the moving picture recorded in the first recording means.***

Specifically, amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

> ***...a user interface configured to receive a user instruction to modify said moving picture recorded in at least one recording increment recorded in said first recording means.***

Amended independent Claims 5-12, are similarly amended to recite a user interface, and therefore the arguments presented below also apply to these claims.

Wactlar describes a digital video library system (10) that annotates digital video automatically by speech and language interpretation, and the transcribed data is stored in a database which can be searched using a conventional keyword search.[4] The segments of video, whose transcribed audio data match the terms provided in the keyword search, are returned to the user as results of the search.[5] Time stamps are stored in association with the segmented video to allow the user to only view portions of the video relevant to his/her search.[6]

However, Wactlar fails to teach or suggest "***a user interface configured to receive a user instruction to modify said moving picture recorded in at least one recording increment recorded in said first recording means***", as recited in amended Claim 1.

Instead, Wactlar describes recording the moving pictures and transcribed audio to a recording medium, and that the moving pictures can be searched using keyword searches to find specific words from the transcribed text corresponding to a particular scene or portion of the moving picture. Further, Wactlar describes that an online capability is provided allowing

[4] Wactlar, Abstract.
[5] Id, col. 7, lines 20-33.
[6] Id, col. 8, lines 15-20.

a user to search and store video files for future use from a remotely located workstation, however such a feature does not allow a user to modify the contents of the database as this would effect the content for the future online users of the system.

Thus, Wactlar fails to describe that his system includes a user interface to modify the stored and segmented video images. Accordingly, at no point does Wactlar teach or suggest "***a user interface configured to receive a user instruction to modify said moving picture recorded in at least one recording increment recorded in said first recording means***", as recited in amended Claim 1.

Regarding Nagano, this reference is relied upon in the outstanding Official Action to address features no longer recited in amended Claim 1. Nonetheless, as Nagano is directed to avoiding data dropout from a recording medium, this reference also fails to teach or suggest the above distinguished features recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1, as well as dependent Claims 2-4 patentably define over Wactlar. For substantially the same reasons as given with respect to amended Claim 1, it is also submitted that Claims 5-15, as amended, also patentably define over Wactlar.

Claims 16/23, 17/24 and 18/25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa and in further view of Riek. As discussed above, Misawa fails to teach or suggest various features recited in Claims 16-18. Likewise, Riek fails to remedy this deficiency, and therefore, none of the cited reference, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicants' Claims 16/23, 17/24 and 18/25 which include the above distinguished limitations by virtue of dependency.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 16/23, 17/24 and 18/25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-25 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
ATH:smi

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\20's\203724-US\203724 AM 12.7.05.DOC